Equal Rights

VOL. XI, No. 23
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY,
JULY 19, 1924

Conferring On The Woman's Party Election Campaign

Governor Baxter, of Maine, thinks that women should support Coolidge

Maud Younger, Congressional Chairman of the Woman's Party, thinks that Coolidge should support women.

Feminist Notes

Women And The American Bar

THE American Bar Association held its forty-seventh annual meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., July 8th, 9th and 10th. Although membership in the association was opened to women only a few years ago, the annual meeting attracted women lawyers from about one-third of the states and the District of Columbia.

New York had 18 women members present, this being the largest number of women from any one state. The District of Columbia with 11 women members in attendance took second place in this respect. Of this number from the District, M. Pearl McCall, assistant district attorney, and Burnita Shelton Matthews, legal research secretary of the National Woman's Party, were delegates. Among the other women present were Mrs. Mabel Walker Willebrandt, Assistant United States Attorney-General; Judge Mary B. Grossman of Ohio, Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, honorary dean of the Washington College of Law, and Miss Emilie M. Bullowa of New York.

While there was a liberal sprinkling of women from every section of the country at the meeting, they received little recognition. They were conspicuous for their absence on the platform, and as speakers and as reporters for committees. A few were allowed to serve on the reception committee. Several were delegates from their respective jurisdictions and infrequently the nomination of a woman on a local council was obtained.

Among the subjects reported by the Committee on Uniform State Laws as under consideration was the Uniform Act for Joint Parental Guardianship of Children. The committee further reported that 19 states have adopted the Desertion and Non-Support of Family Act, approved in 1910; that 4 states have adopted the Illegitimacy Act, approved in 1922; that 2 states have adopted the Marriage and Marriage License Act, approved in 1911, and that 5 states have adopted the Marriage Evasion Act, approved in 1912.

The Women Lawyers' Association also held its annual meeting in Philadelphia on July 7th and 8th. This association was organized on a national scale only last year and the July meeting was its second annual meeting. Officers for the coming year were elected as follows: Rose Falls Bres, New York, president; Henrietta A. Neuhaus, New York, treasurer; Marion Gold Lewis, New York, recording secretary; Katherine R. Pike, District of Columbia, corresponding secretary; Judge Florence E. Allen, Ohio, chairman general council.

Women In Medicine

THE *Journal of the American Medical Association*, for July 5th, reports that the results of the May examination of the London University give evidence of the increasing success of the women students. For the M.B., B.S. examination, which ranks first among medical degrees in England, there were thirty-four women out of seventy-nine who passed the examinations, and three out of ten in the honors list. A woman also carried off the gold medal. The same magazine also notes that the first woman member has been elected to the council of the British Medical Association. She is Dr. Christine Murrell of London.

Do You Know Why
The
Election Conference
Is Being Held
By The
Woman's Party?

Subscribe To Equal Rights

Equal Rights In England

THE Equal Rights movement in England is strikingly similar to the same movement in this country. A bird's eye view of the English movement is given in *Opportunity* for June, a paper published in London by the Federation of Women Civil Servants. This account says:

> "Slowly, inch by inch, women are climbing up the hill of Equality. The latest step gained is a stage on the Equal Franchise road, and, though there are many who feel that the equalization would have been better gained by raising the age for men, there was very little opposition to granting men and women the vote on the same terms.
>
> "In this case the issue was a straight one and the result cannot be nullified by any subsequent question of interpretation, such as we have experienced with that other legal instrument of equality (or rather, inequality) the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act. The longer we live the more we realize what a travesty of law this measure is. And yet it seems so clearly what we wanted! 'A person shall not be disqualified by sex or marriage'—and a peeress in her own right is disqualified by reason of sex from taking her place in the House of Lords; numbers of married women have been disqualified by reason of marriage from holding public posts; and this in addition to the sanctioned loophole given by the Act for the exclusion of women from the Diplomatic and Consular Service, a barring clause which was eagerly made use of in the House recently in answer to a question by the Duchess of Atholl as to the appointment of a British woman resident to a consular post for which a man resident was not to be found.
>
> "This latter inequality is, however, one which can be fought, as it is a clear issue; but would we could say the same of the inequalities imposed on women in the Home Service! There is hardly a day passes in which those dealing with Civil Service business are not struck by some differentiation in the treatment of men and women employed on the same work, from the woman writing assistant, doing work handed over from the clerical men and paid at two scales lower, to the woman staff officer doing the same work as the higher executive man, but graded superclerical to render her ineligible for further promotion. Inside the service we are fighting, not a tangible Act of Parliament, but the most intangible of enemies, 'Prejudice.' It rarely admits its existence, for which it is the most deadly, and it can be fought only by civil servants themselves; but every step taken outside towards equality helps us on our way, and therefore we are doubly rejoicing at the recent gain in the matter of Equal Franchise."

Women In Sweden

FINANCIAL stress in Sweden is the cause of bills of interest to women being held up in the Swedish Parliament, writes Frigga Carlburg in *The International Woman Suffrage News* for June. "It is an old experience all over the world," she comments, "that when in hard times a home is bound to economize, the first who has to suffer under the restrictions is the mother. The Swedish state has, like all other countries after the war, bad finances, which must be repaired, and one of the economies practiced is to refuse bills concerning the position of women and their needs."

Among the many women's bills rejected, writes Miss Carlburg, was one providing for the care of poor mothers and their children. (This bill has been pending in committee for nine years and has been refused consideration for "financial reasons.") Another is the old bill, "Equal Pay for Equal Work"—intended to help the women in the civil service. This bill also was rejected this session and the excuse given was again "for financial reasons."

The "Women For Congress" Conference

"WOMEN for Congress" will be the battle-cry of the Woman's Party at its national election conference at Westport, New York, on August 15th, 16th and 17th. The conference has been called to determine the best method to get women elected to Congress.

"We feel that this 'Women for Congress' conference will have a powerful influence in the November elections," said Alice Paul, vice-president of the Woman's Party, as she left the National Headquarters this week for Westport to assist in the preparations for the conference. "England has eight women in Parliament; Germany had more than thirty women in the last Reichstag; there are numbers of women in the Parliaments of other European countries. We must bring the United States up to the standard which other countries have reached.

"There should be women in Congress—it matters not to us whether they are Republican, Democratic, Farmer-Labor or Independent—who will work from the vantage ground of the inside to further the interests of women and to express the woman's point of view.

"We have asked our members to bring to this conference the names of possible women candidates for Congress. At the conference we shall decide which candidates to support and shall launch the campaign to ensure their election."

Westport, New York
August 15th, 16th and 17th

HEADQUARTERS for the conference have been established at the Westport Inn, Westport, New York, on the banks of Lake Champlain. Here may be seen a large committee of Woman's Party organizers busily engaged in preparing for the hundreds of officers and members of the Woman's Party who have signified their intention of attending the conference.

Organization work is being done through the Westport Headquarters and through the National Headquarters of the Woman's Party at Washington, D. C., to find the most suitable women for Congress. The women delegates who attended the recent Republican, Democratic and Farmer-Labor conventions were interviewed on the question of women running for Congress, and many possible candidates were discovered. Woman's Party organizers are now covering the middle west and far western states in the hunt for suitable women candidates to run on one of the regular party tickets or to run as independents. The situation in the east and the south, in regard to women candidates, is fairly well known by the Woman's Party, and information regarding women candidates in the west is being sent to the Washington Headquarters every day.

DELEGATES to the conference at Westport are scheduled to arrive from practically every state. Some will come by train, but a great many are motoring across the country. The latter will have their cars decorated with the purple, white and gold banners of the Woman's Party, and will stop in the cities and villages en route to Westport—to broadcast the call to this epoch-making "Women for Congress" election conference.

Women Composers

By Gaeta Ivorda Wold Boyer

Editor's Note: Mrs. Boyer was for some time music and dramatic editor of the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oregon.

THE holographic display of women composers' work, which is being shown at the National Congressional Library, is interesting as showing the advance women have made in musical composition. Just now a number of women rank among the foremost of American composers, especially in the song-writing world.

Not so long ago this would have been considered a matter of great wonder. Women were expected to tinkle away on a picturesque pianoforte, in properly ladylike fashion, confining themselves mostly to saccharinely feminine melodies, such as "The Maiden's Prayer." Now not only are they playing virile compositions on full-grown pianos with sixty-horse-power strokes, as witness Theresa Carreno and Olga Steeb, but they are actually writing virile compositions themselves.

There is one sonata shown, written by Rebecca Clarke, that has been played by Harold Bauer, one of our most virile and discriminating artists. To have written a composition worthy of his art and interpretation might well add a prideful stone to anyone's monument of fame, be it man or woman.

The original and autographed scores now at the library include songs by Mrs. H. H. A. Beach, Gena Branscombe, Mary Turner Salter, Jessie L. Gaynor, Harriet Ware, Fay Foster, Gloria Gage (Mrs. Lyman Gage), Fanny Snow Knowlton, Patty Stair, Mabel W. Daniels, Margaret Ruthven Lang, Helen Hopekirk, Natalie Curtis Burlin, Helen Hood and Mary Helen Brown. Instrumental numbers include compositions by Mrs. Crosby Adams, Fannie Dillon, Theodora Dutton and Clara Kathleen Rogers. There are also operas or operatic sketches by Mary Carr Moore and Eleanor Everest Freer.

SOME of the work is exquisite from the mechanical standpoint as well as the musical, with beautifully drawn notes and delicately traced directions. It is interesting to compare the handwriting of the composers of the more modern era with that of an earlier generation; the added dash and freedom of Fay Foster's and Gena Branscombe's script seem to typify the greater freedom of the feminism of their age. The work of Theodora Dutton, of the older school, in "Serenade d'Arlequin," is like a dainty bit of engraving, and reminds one of a cameo-like daguerrotype. Natalie Curtis Burlin has the added talent of sketching, and the song, "Couldn't Hear Nobody Pray," bears a cover of her own designing with an African theme.

"Narcissa" is truly feminist—an operatic sketch by Mary Carr Moore, with the libretto by Sarah Pratt Carr, written around Narcissa, the wife of Marcus Whitman, as the heroine and chief character in this musical picture of their missionary adventures among the Indians of the Northwest.

An interesting number is "Birds at Dawn," instrumental, written by Fannie Dillon, depicting the ensemble effect of bird songs at dawn in the Sierra Madre mountains of California. These songs have been identified and authenticated by Mrs. Harriet Myers, secretary of the Southern California Audubon Society, and a well-known authority on California birds.

THERE is an additional display of holograph scores of modern works of chamber music, the gift of Mrs. Frederic Shurtleff Coolidge of Pittsfield, Massachusetts. Mrs. Coolidge is the mother of the famous Berkshire annual festivals, which have done so much toward encouraging American composers. Among the composers of this type of music, which is one of the highest, most difficult and, maybe, least understood forms of music, is Rebecca Clarke, who has three scores shown, all of which have received honorable awards at the festivals. May Mukle, cellist, and Myra Hess, pianist, gave the first performance of her rhapsody. A sonata was played by Harold Bauer and Louis Bailly.

Altogether, this is an interesting display for those concerned with the progress of women in a man's world.

Equal Rights

OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill
Washington, D. C.

Published weekly
at 19 West Chase Street
Baltimore, Md.

Edith Houghton Hooker, ... Editor
Dora G. Ogle, . . . Business Manager

Associate Editors:

Nina E. Allender
Zoe Beckley
Brenda Euland Benedict
Elaine Sterne Carrington
Lucia Chamberlain
Mabel Potter Daggett
Phyllis Duganne
Crystal Eastman
Rose Feld
Zona Gale
Helen Davenport Gibbons
Lydia Gibson
Joan Grayson
Rebecca Hourwich
Ruth Hale
Inez Haynes Irwin
Ada Davenport Kendall
Katherine Leckie
Hazel MacKaye
Edna St. Vincent Millay
Ruth Pickering
Alice Rohe
Maryse Rutledge
Miriam Finn Scott
Doris Stevens
Sophie Treadwell
Mary Winsor

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice, Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1870.

Subscription, $2.00 A Year

COUNCIL OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

President, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont
Vice-Presidents, Alice Paul,
Elizabeth Selden Rogers,
Margaret Whittemore,
Mrs. J. D. Wilkinson,
Myrtle Cain.
Chairman National Council, Elsie Hill
First Vice-Chairman, Gail Laughlin
Secretary, Anita Pollitzer
Treasurer, Edith Ainge
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger
Finance Chairman, Mrs. Stephen Pell
Headquarters Director, Martha Souder
Hdqrs. Furnishing Chr'n, Florence Bayard Hilles
Hdqrs. Maintenance Chr'n, Mrs. Richard Wainwright.

Anne Archbold
Florence B. Boeckel
Mrs. R. J. Caldwell
Lavinia Egan
Zona Gale
Sara Grogan
Edith Houghton Hooker
Inez Haynes Irwin
Mrs. William Kent
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis
Sophie G. Meredith
Dora G. Ogle
Mrs. Townsend Scott
Lois Warren Shaw
Dr. Caroline Spencer
Doris Stevens
Mabel Vernon
Amelia Himes Walker
Sue White
Mrs. Robert Whitehouse
Mary Winsor

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues $10.00
Associate Members $1.00
Founders $100.00
Life Members $1,000.00
Endowers $5,000.00
Sustainers $5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

To remove all forms of the subjection of women.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 21.
House Joint Resolution Number 75.]

Introduced in the Senate, December 10, 1923, by Senator Charles E. Curtis.
Introduced in the House of Representatives, December 13, 1923, by Representative D. R. Anthony.

The Result of the Conventions

ANOTHER national political convention—the Socialist convention—has this week gone on record concerning Equal Rights for women. This makes the national convention record as follows:

The Republican convention took no action.

The Democratic convention took no action.

The Farmer-Labor convention endorsed the principle of Equal Rights in its platform and passed a resolution calling upon Congress to submit the Equal Rights Amendment to the state legislatures.

The La Follette convention endorsed the removal of legal discriminations against women, but did not endorse the full Equal Rights program put before it by the Woman's Party.

The Socialist convention endorsed the removal of legal discriminations against women, but did not endorse the full Equal Rights program put before it by the Woman's Party.

The action of these conventions shows us clearly that we must depend upon ourselves to fight the battle for a better position for women. None of the political conventions, not even the Farmer-Labor convention, which went further than any of the others, showed any real interest in removing all vestiges of the subjection of women. Women alone will have to do this.

At the Woman's Party election conference, August 15th, 16th and 17th, at Westport, New York, we shall plan the battle to be carried on in the elections, realizing that in ourselves we must trust—and not in the political parties who have shown themselves so indifferent or so opposed to the great movement for the freedom of women which is sweeping the world. During this election campaign the Woman's Party must hold aloft the banner of the woman movement—for no other group will do so.

If Wishes Were Horses

IT is not enough in this rough world to wish for things; practical, hard work is the only means known to man or woman for transforming desires into realities. We might have gone on until the crash of doom yearning for woman suffrage, and have descended into our graves without ever casting a ballot, had we been content with wishing, instead of working for votes for women.

The reason why women are enfranchised today, the reason why they participated in the recent political conventions, is because a few years since, a certain small number of women worked with all the zest there was in them to secure for their sex this symbol of freedom. But the symbol is not sufficient, nor did any intelligent person ever suppose that it would be. Equal suffrage is the key to open the door to Equal Rights, but it is of no use if it merely rests in the lock idly. Power is dissipated if it is not used, but effort is required for its utilization.

In the struggle for Equal Rights the point of first importance is solidarity among the workers. It is of little use to add a new member to our ranks if meanwhile another member withdraws or becomes discouraged. We do not wish to progress one step forward and two steps back. We wish to go constantly onward. To this end we are with this issue inaugurating a campaign to double our subscription list before the end of August. Only one-fourth of the membership of the Party subscribes for "Equal Rights," and it is clearly impossible for those who do not subscribe to keep in touch with the campaign or to maintain their maximum usefulness. The plan we propose is simple in the extreme. Let each of our present subscribers send in one new subscription within the next four weeks, and the task will be accomplished! It sounds easy, doesn't it? And it will be easy, too, if each member realizes that the success of the venture depends upon her alone. With "Equal Rights" coming each week, giving the salient points of the campaign, keeping us all in touch with the movement and with one another, the effectiveness of the work preceding the November elections will be enormously heightened.

Let each of us pledge ourselves, no matter where we are or what else we are doing, to make just this one contribution to "Equal Rights," so that four weeks from today we can proudly announce that we have doubled our circulation. Will you help? Upon your reply depends the success of the undertaking.

Socialists Endorse Equality In Law

AT the National Socialist convention which met in Cleveland, July 6th, a plank was adopted by the Socialist Party which read:

> "Removal of legal discriminations against women by measures not prejudicial to legislation necessary for the protection of women and for the advancement of social welfare."

This was the same plank as the one adopted at the La Follette convention the same week.

A resolution asking for the endorsement of the Equal Rights Amendment and calling for complete Equal Rights between men and women was submitted to the convention by Mrs. Mary Bohlin of Ridgefield, New Jersey, a member of the Woman's Party, and a delegate to the Socialist convention. It was not acted upon by the Resolutions Committee or by the convention.

The adoption of the plank in the platform of this convention marked the third time recognition has been given to the removal of sex discriminations by a political party. The Socialist platform and the La Follette platform, while better than the Republican and Democratic platforms on this subject, did not touch upon the removal of discriminations against women in any field except the law. No mention was made of economic, educational and political equality.

Headquarters of the Woman's Party were established on the day of the Convention in a prominent place in the lobby of the Hotel Statler, and members of the Woman's Party, headed by Lucy Branham of Washington, national organizer, and Janet Hills of Cleveland, organizer for Ohio, interviewed practically every delegate to the convention in the interest of the Equal Rights Amendment. Many petitions were signed asking that the convention endorse the amendment.

What Women Are Thinking

CICILY HAMILTON

FROM "A PAGEANT OF GREAT WOMEN"

"I HAVE no quarrel with you, but I stand
For the clear right to hold my life my own:
The clear, clean right. To mould it as I will,—
Not as you will, with or apart from you
To make of it a thing of brain and blood,
Of tangible substance and of turbulent thought—
No thin, gray shadow of the life of man!
Your love, perchance, may set a crown on it;
But I may crown myself in other ways
(As you have done, who are in one flesh with me).
I have no quarrel with you; but, henceforth
This you must know: The world is mine as yours—
The pulsing strength and passion and hurt of it:
The work I set my hand to, woman's work,
Because I set my hand to it."

English Leaders On Protective Legislation

THE question of special labor laws applying to women but not to men is agitating English women as well as American women. It is instructive to read the conclusions on this subject of some of the leaders of thought in England. For this reason we reprint from the *International Woman Suffrage News* statements by English women.

The first statement on the subject is in the nature of an editorial discussion. It is as follows:

"IF I understand Mrs. Swartz aright in her article in the May number of the *International Woman Suffrage News,* we are fully agreed that the general conditions in industry the world over need reforming and reorganizing; we are agreed that the conditions under which many men—as well as women—work, make anything like a full human life impossible. At the back of our several efforts there lies, I imagine, the same idea—to help women particularly (since we are women) to that fuller human life. But on the way and the means to that end we are—and I fear we must remain—in utter divergence. Mrs. Swartz holds that, in order to be very moderately free, the industrial woman must be hedged in, protected, propped up, guarded. My reply is that women will never be free, either industrially or any other way, until they are able to stand firm and upright upon their own feet, and that, however much temporary benefit may apparently accrue from limitations on women in industry, the ultimate effect—though that ultimate effect might conceivably be long in becoming apparent—will have very much the effect of the binding of the feet of the women of China.

"I do not think that in my earlier notes I said that restrictive legislation was the sole reason for unequal pay, bad conditions, low wages, since those evils are universal and restriction, so far, is not. I pointed it out as one of the factors in that vicious circle, and as a factor that may eventually help to perpetuate rather than cure the low economic position of women in the labour market. I further said that to ask in one breath for equal pay, equal opportunity and special conditions is self-contradictory.

"Nor did I suggest that women are 'cheap' because of restrictive legislation. On the contrary, in another sense they may become very 'dear'—to the employer. His charges are greater because he has to meet the special requirements of the Factory Acts and the cost of welfare work, and the tendency therefore is to plead justification for a lower occupational rate for women—and there vanishes equal pay; or even in some cases to replace the women by men, though women may be quite competent at that particular job—and there vanishes equal opportunity.

"NOR are women cheap 'because the great majority are not supporters of families and are paid as individuals.' It is a common and convenient assumption that wages are in some vague way determined by family obligations. But there is not an atom of evidence to support that assumption. No employer asks his workman whether he is married or single, whether he has two children or ten, or regulates his wage-sheet accordingly. A man is paid at the rate current for the job, whatever his family obligations may be. Nor would the trade unions accept for one moment any arrangement for the payment of workmen according to their family needs. I may perhaps mention that during the war in this country there were some attempts to introduce awards which included allowances for dependents. The Swansea Copper Works award was one—and it was eventually reversed. Another instance was that of the Newcastle-on-Tyne, Neath Corporation, and others. In this case the provision was definitely opposed by the Amalgamated Association of Tramway and Vehicle Workers, who claimed instead a flat advance. The representatives of the workers urged 'the necessity to get rid of what we regard as a nasty stigma on the single men.'

"An equally empty assumption is that all men have family obligations, and that the industrial woman has none. The fol-

lowing figures were worked out for Miss Eleanor Rathbone by the London School of Economics, and show that of English male workers over 20, roughly speaking—

"27 per cent. are bachelors or widowers without dependent children;

"24.7 per cent. are married couples without children or with no dependent children below 14;

"16.6 per cent. have one dependent;

"13 per cent. have two dependent children;

"9.9 per cent. have more than three dependent children.

"It is calculated that not less than 18 per cent. of women in industry have dependents—a child or children, or an adult, dependent or partially dependent on them. No—from whatever aspect we approach it, the argument that the woman is cheap because she is just an individual will not hold good. We have to go further yet before we discern the underlying reasons for the cheapness of women. It is certainly not because she is inherently inefficient. During the war it was irrefutably proved that in many processes women were superior to men—though, of course, they were never paid at the same rate, in spite of Government pledges!

"BUT when Mrs. Swartz says that women are cheap 'because they have worked so long for nothing,' and so long for next to nothing, and because they have been 'too obedient,' and that these are age-long ideas which it will be difficult to overcome, then we begin to come into agreement. Thus they have worked, and thus they have been very largely, because of the common acceptance of what, in her admirable Minority Report of the War Cabinet Committee on Women in Industry, Mrs. Sidney Webb calls the principle of the 'vested interest of the male.' This is the last and the most evil assumption, the assumption that industry is normally a function of the male, and that women, like non-adults, are only to be permitted to work for wages at special hours, for special rates of wages, under special supervision, and subject to special restrictions by the Legislature.' It is that belief—the belief that they are a class apart, a class that does not need so much as men in return, though it may give as much in service, a class which must be obedient—that has fettered women far more than anything else has done, in industry, and in the professions as well. Restrictive legislation, whatever transitory benefit may accrue or be anticipated from it, is in the long run but a further rivet in those fetters. I do not deny that there may indeed be that temporary and perhaps very apparent benefit, and especially in such cases as Mrs. Swartz quotes. But I still contend that the seen benefit is not worth the unseen loss—the loss of a real possibility of the free development of women.

"Mrs. Swartz sees no such possibility in front of women in industry simply because their conditions at present are so indisputably bad that they seem to call for relief at any price. Had she made this point at a stage when men in industry objected to any legislative interference with their work it would have been a better one. But she confesses that the working men in America are turning more and more to the protection of the law. Our own special factory legislation for women came first into being at a time when men's trade unions objected to any legislative interference. But that day is past, and that being the case (I quote from the Minority Report), 'there is no reason why the prescribed national minimum with regard to sanitation and amenity in the factory, with regard to the provision of medical attendance, and with regard to securing a due proportion of each 24 hours for rest and recreation, should be any lower or any different for workers of one sex than for workers of the other.' To attempt to obtain those better conditions for all by enforced protection for women only is, in my view, an unsound and very dangerous expedient.

"From Mrs. Swartz's picture of endless but mildly alleviated drudgery, from her picture of women forever shut in a room without a view, I recoil instinctively. Indeed, after reading her article, I recoiled straight on to a volume of Walt Whitman, and I somehow hope that his 'barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world' is the truer picture of the two. That prophet of American democracy stood above all things for the realization of perfect and free individuals; it was he who told us to 'see eternity in men and women, and not to see men and women in dreams and dots'; it was he who told us that 'no one can grow for another—not one; no one can acquire for another—not one. I swear the earth shall be complete to him or her who shall be complete; the earth remains jagged or broken only to him or her who remains jagged and broken.' And as I read I found also the answer which was in me to that suggestion that I and others may have a room with a view, a race and a prize, eternally denied to the working woman. That son of Manhattan shall answer for me in his own words: 'By God! I will accept nothing which all cannot have their counterpart of on their own terms.'"

THE next statement is by Mrs. Millicent G. Fawcett, LL.D., and a Justice of the Peace in England. For many years she was the President of the National Union of Woman Suffrage Societies, and is one of the outstanding leaders among English women. Mrs. Fawcett writes:

* * * "We also are constantly urging industrial women either to form trade unions or to join those which already exist. But if hours of labour, the rate of wages and other important conditions are settled by statute, the inducement to women to protect themselves by trade union action is largely weakened. For the very lowest classes of labour—for women, that is, who are normally receiving less than a living wage—protective legislation may be necessary; but in adopting it we should not lose sight of the fact that it deprives women of the educational effect of self-help, and deepens the impression already held by large numbers of both sexes that women are essentially inferior as economic units and must be dependent on the favour and mercy of men. Therefore, in my view, where special legislative 'protection' for women is adopted, it should be regarded as a necessary evil, and removed as soon as the workers have achieved a position of greater independence.

"In this country we have to face the fact that there are masses of men, in and out of trade unions, who are determined not to let women gain the entry into the better paid classes of labour, whether industrial or professional. They have recently been described by Mrs. Annott Robinson, herself an industrial woman and secretary of the Manchester and Salford Labour Women's Advisory Council, as men who 'bitterly grudge the wages earned by women in decent posts. In Government offices, in municipal employment, in warehouses, in engineering works and other places women employes have been and are being dismissed to make way for male competitors, as a result of pressure exercised by organized bodies of men to secure their dismissal.'

"'Protection' to women means, in these cases, power to prevent their competition in the labour market, by shutting in their faces all the best-paid employments. This makes many of us feel that the really valuable thing to work for is a fair field and no favour in industry as well as in the professions, and equal pay for equal work."

THE next statement is by Mrs. Ray Strachey, one of the officers of the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship. Mrs. Strachey is one of the most prominent of the younger feminist leaders in England. Mrs. Strachey writes:

"Mrs. Swartz, speaking for American industrial women in your last issue, makes a very strong plea for protective legislation for women; and if I for my part remain suspicious of it, it is not for lack of sympathy with the position she depicts. 'We are hands,' she says, 'and for lack of education, environment, the very necessities of industry itself, the vast majority of us will remain hands. * * * There is no race and no prize with us. We are the

hewers of wood of the world—one in a million of us steps out.' From this statement she draws the conclusion that anything which will make life less hard, and which will protect women workers against the ever-present menace of exploitation, is worth snatching at, although she admits that women of education with a chance to advance should have a fair field and no favour.

"I do not wish to speak about conditions in America, about which I know little; but surely her argument is an unsound one even there. For if the adoption of protective legislation for women only is bad for workers with hopes and prospects, it is surely a sad abandonment of hope to welcome it for industrial women. It is like saying that slavery is good for the slave because he will be so lost and helplost without his master's protection; or like that other more modern but equally fallacious argument that a living-in domestic servant is bound to be happier than an outside worker because she is 'protected.'

"Of course, it is true enough that a great deal of protection is needed for workers who are liable to be exploited; my contention is that this protection is needed by men as well as women, and that to extend it to women only is the wrong way 'round. It appeases the public conscience—and handicaps the women. The only differential protective legislation I want to see is that arising from genuine physiological differences, such as protection during childbirth. And even then we must be very careful that the matter is assessed rightly, and that, under cover of false physiology, the liberties of women are not snatched away.

"I will give an illustration from Great Britain. There has been in existence a piece of so-called protective legislation which prevented women (and not men) from working on the two-shift system. During the war this was suspended, but after it a great effort was made to have it reimposed. A lot of play was made of the argument that women ought not to get up early or go to bed late, and that the two-shift system upset the normal arrangements of life. All this is true; but it is as true for men and no one so much as suggested cutting them off from it. In the case of women it would mean the loss of employment to—roughly—35,000; but fortunately it did not pass.

"Now this example is even more significant than it seems. There can be no doubt at all that if the hours of work of the 'hewers of wood of the world' are ever to be reduced to really tolerable proportions—to the five or six hours which would leave time and strength for a real life to workers—it can only be done by the shift system. Experiments in this direction have already begun, and I have myself great hopes that a really short working shift will in the end prove the solution of the problem of women in industry. To cut women out of this movement altogether under the guise of 'protecting' them would, it seems to me, have been shortsighted in the extreme, and I am therefore thankful that the attempt failed.

"I do not want to be doctrinaire on this subject, but I am convinced that every piece of protective legislation which is aimed at women and not at men needs careful scrutiny. Do not let us despair of women in industry and condemn them everlastingly to the place of the under dog!"

THE last statement in this symposium is by A. Helen Ward, and is as follows:

"'I *will* be drowned; nobody *shall* save me.' This, we were taught as children, was not the way to talk when we were in deep water, unless we wanted to be drowned, for such a misuse of these illusive auxiliary verbs, 'shall' and 'will,' might inadvertently discourage would-be rescuers. But surely the burden of Mrs. Swartz's able article is 'We *will* be oppressed; nobody *shall* help us to help ourselves.' Her words are: 'We think that the woman of education with a chance to advance should have a fair field and no favour, as she really is obliged to compete with man for the race and the prize.'

"'There is no race and no prize with us. We are the hewers of wood of the world.' Well, that is the question. Just that education which Mrs. Swartz generously grants as the privilege of one small class, but which, we think, is the right of all, teaches us that the 'hewers of wood' idea is played out. I will utter no word of Greek to annoy Mrs. Swartz, but the poor playwright, who wrote in English as plain as hers or mine, said: 'The fault lies, dear madam, not in our stars, but in ourselves if we are underlings.'"

"Little Girls Shall Be Little Girls"

By Rebecca Hourwich

WE torchbearers of the Woman's Party are often accused of blazing our lights a little too insistently and a little too incessantly. While we urge the cause of feminism our more enlightened brethren insist that all problems can be reduced to human terms, and that there are no problems of a specific feminine character.

Sometimes, though, one does doubt, one grows weary, and it requires a new burst of enthusiasm to be able to go on proving fifty specifically catalogued discriminations, in varied dramatic array, as a plea for the freedom of women.

It is in strange places we regain inspiration.

I have had a vague idea that some day my five-year-old daughter Faith would be a feminist, but inasmuch as she has no brothers, the equality issue has never been raised. Once Faith wanted to know why, if I could be Miss Hourwich and Mrs. Ryher, could not she be both Miss Ryher and Miss Hourwich? I regarded this as an early manifestation of a true feminist sense.

Faith went to school for the first time this winter and learned many ways of the world with which previously she had been unfamiliar. Apparently, she had been unaware of the great existing differences in the sexes and the biological and psychological necessity of emphasizing that difference. But a change has come, and Faith sees the world as made up of boys and girls. Faith is 100 per cent. girl.

There is a persistent demand for hair ribbons which she wears on her tangled bob of curls and loses almost immediately, for she does not always remember she is a girl. There is a suppressed desire for a raw pink, "a pink party color."

But these are passing fancies as compared to the subject of dresses, which has become a serious one. Faith has delivered an ultimatum which she redeclares at every chance. "I am a little girl. Little girls should wear dresses. Girls don't wear trousers; boys do. I won't wear any more trousers! I want dresses, and little drawers, or bloomers that my dresses come down and cover."

The theory is entrenched beyond the hope of reason. If I suggest to Faith that she can walk better and climb better in short smocks and scant trousers, she assures me that she climbs and walks just as well in dresses, and that she does not mind having to be careful.

I cannot ascribe this change that has taken place in my daughter in the past year to a dawning adolescence, for she is only five, and I think even the Freudians would not lay it to a sex urge. Nor can I feel that Faith has become prejudiced by the raging welfare controversy, with its insistence on femaleness, for she does not read, and, to my knowledge, has never attended a Woman's Party meeting pro or con.

I suspect that "little girls must be little girls and little boys must be little boys" may be a clue. The standards of my little girl's world demand femaleness. As a mother I am impotent. I do not believe in forcing children to the proud isolation preferred by their parents.

But as a torchbearer I rekindle my flame.

From The Press

It Seems To Me

By HEYWOOD BROUN

New York World, May 22.

"FOR a good many centuries the medical profession was far too complacent about the facts of birth. The drive against pain and suffering usually left maternity out of consideration. 'It's nature's way,' the doctor said, and seemed to feel that this was the last word.

"The world ought to know by this time that nature's way may be amended here and there without obvious danger to the race. Most of us war against nature every day. A barber shop is a very citadel of rebellion against the intention of nature.

"But the right of dissent is coming only very slowly to women. When twilight sleep was first introduced into this country, doctors fought against it less on medical grounds than because it was an attempt to frustrate the curse placed upon Eve. Of course, I am not qualified to answer those objections against twilight sleep which are based upon strictly medical grounds, but I do think that it is up to doctors to lighten the rigors of life-giving. The modern woman is not going to accept forever the bland pronouncement about nature's way. The ordeal of maternity can be and will be made more tolerable.

"Even without that a somewhat easy reform is possible. Because children are desired and desirable, the world—and this includes many a mendacious woman—has entered into a conspiracy to set up false and sentimental illusions. Young women are cold-bloodedly deceived as to the nature of their time of trial. Little truth is spoken concerning the rendezvous of anguish. Women who find themselves unhappy in the role of expectant motherhood are told that they are abnormal and neurotic, and that any wholesome female should rejoice in her lot. She would be silly to do so. There's no point in lying about the price. Let us be frank and confess that women must pay high for children. Of all potential prenatal influences, the best should be the truth."

Students For Equal Rights

Nation, June 7.

"THE students of the University of Chicago have nominated Senator La Follette as their candidate for President. The students in Contemporary Civilization at Columbia University have voted by large majorities for government ownership of railroads, nationalization of mines, Equal Rights for women, conservation, the League of Nations—and, by a smaller margin, for amending the Volstead Act. Thus little shoots of free thought raise their heads in the unfertile fields of American education, where the process of exterminating mental vigor goes on unabated."

Two Million Dollar Fund

Treasurer's Report

EDITH AINGE: *Treasurer*

NETTIE TRAIL: *Auditor: C. P. A.*

RECEIPTS of National Headquarters, December 7th, 1912, to June 26th, 1924, $1,257,658.01.

Contributions, membership receipts and other receipts, June 26th, 1924, to July 3rd, 1924. (*Half of membership fees are retained by the State Headquarters. The half of these fees sent to National Headquarters are listed below*):

Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Pa.	$50.00
Miss Ruth Hale, N. Y.	50.00
Miss Katharine Hughes, N. Y.	1.00
Per New York City Committee:	
Mr. Stephen Pell	25.00
Miss Gretchen Dick	.50
Per Washington Branch:	
Mrs. Della Whittelsey	5.00
Mrs. Anna T. Milburn	5.00
Mrs. J. W. Cody	.50
Mrs. J. L. Lane	.50
Mrs. Rose B. Archerman	.50
Mrs. K. Maxwell	.50
Mrs. Antoine Kuhnhausen	.50
Mrs. Anna M. Johnson	.50
Mrs. Catherine Shearles	.50
Mrs. Agnes Johnson	.50
Mrs. Mary A. Chilson	.50
Mrs. R. Loewe	.50
Mrs. J. H. Little	.50
Mrs. Marie Ziebell	.50
Mrs. Emma Jones	.50
Miss Dorothy O. Diamond	.50
Per Mrs. Wainwright's Committee:	
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.	25.00
Miss Mary A. Burnham, Pa.	25.00
Miss Marion May, N. Y.	25.00
Mrs. Hazel B. Ewing, Ill.	25.00
Miss Clara M. Hill, Mexico	10.00
Mrs. Ruth Baker-Crothers, N. H.	10.00
Miss B. M. Boomer, Fla.	1.00
Mrs. Francis H. Dodds, Mich.	1.00
Miss Dorothy Dodds, Mich.	1.00
Miss Eliza Tonks, D. C.	80.00
Mrs. Harriet Trix, Mich.	25.00
Mrs. Sarah A. Sampson, Mich.	10.00
Mrs. Norma P. Durant, Wis.	100.00
Per Wisconsin Branch:	
Miss Emma Grimshaw	.50
Miss Frances Wettstein	.50
Miss Ella Seligman	.50
Miss Emily F. Webster	.50
Miss Elizabeth A. Winkler	.50
Mrs. Herman Haessler	5.00
Miss Dorothy Haessler	.50
Miss Leola Hirschman	.50
Miss Dorothy C. Rice	5.00
Miss Dorothy Walker	.50
Miss Alma Barry	.50
Mrs. George F. DeWein	5.00
Miss Lillian Kingston	.50
Miss Nellie Roach	5.00
Miss Anne P. Richards	.50
Miss Lillian M. Wood	.50
Mrs. F. J. Wittl	10.00
Mrs. F. C. Schroeder	5.00
Miss Ethel M. Gardner	5.00
Miss Mary Louise Davis, Mass.	1.00
Per District of Columbia Branch:	
Miss M. P. Beck	.50
Mrs. Natalie Boynton	2.75
Dr. L. A. DeVilbiss	.50
Miss Elizabeth F. King	.25
Miss Julia Solomons	.50
Miss Anita McClure	.50
Miss Louise Park	.25
Miss Carrie Harrison	.50
Miss Minnie K. Lowther	.50
Miss Lucile G. Harroun	.25
Miss Mattie L. McMorris	2.50
Miss Caroline Mytinger	.25
Miss Adele V. Smith	.50
Miss Clara S. Peetz	.50
Mrs. M. Henrietta Smith	.50
Miss Margaret Blaine	.25
Miss E. J. Giffin	.25
Miss Bessie K. Blanchard	.50
Mrs. Letitia F. Snow	5.00
Miss Ella A. Enlows	.50
Miss Edith Goode	2.50
Miss Helen A. Colhoun	2.50
Miss Queenie Panck	.50
Miss Louisa Panck	.50
Mrs. Mary E. Panck	.50
Miss Kathryn C. Bonner	.50
Miss Jessie Patton	.25
Mrs. Donald D. Conn	.25
Mrs. Irene E. Drayton	2.50
Miss Sarah M. Ruhlin, N. Y.	2.10
Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, N. Y.	2,500.00
Mrs. Ella L. B. Darlington, Pa.	25.00
Mrs. Alfred C. Clas, Wis.	25.00
Miss E. G. McCarthy, D. C.	1.00
Miss Harriette Wood, D. C.	1.00
Total receipts, June 26, 1924, to July 3, 1924	$3,316.10
Total receipts, December 7, 1912, to July 3, 1924	$1,260,974.11

HOTEL DU PONT

Ideal Accomodations for Automobilists

Convenient Garages

Excellent Cuisine

HARRY J. HARKINS, Manager

Wilmington Delaware

Telephone 3140

KLEIN'S

The Woman's Shop on Capitol Hill.

128-130 3rd St. S. E.

Washington, D. C.

Hats—Blouses—Lingerie—Frocks

DAY PRINTING COMPANY

Printers

LIGHT AND LOMBARD STREETS

Entrance on Balderston Street

BALTIMORE

WHITE, Inc.

Florist

S. E. corner 14th and H Streets N. W.

Washington, D. C.

Telephones:

Main 6953 - Franklin 9369

La Zelle—Hats

1417 U Street

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Specializing in Remodeling and Copying

Hats Out of the Ordinary

Gowns Remodeled

KANSAS WOMAN'S JOURNAL

Topeka, Kansas

Published in Interest of Women, Children and Home.

By LILLA DAY MONROE

$1.00 A Year

"Join Our Journal Family Now."

Back Numbers Wanted of Equal Rights

25 cents each will be paid for all copies of issues Nos. 1 and 4, Vol. 1, of EQUAL RIGHTS.

Send to 19 W. Chase Street, Baltimore, Md.

The office would also like the following issues of Equal Rights for 1923

Feb. 17 and 24—Mar. 3, 10 and 17—Nov. 24